

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/543,612	04/05/2000	Brian T. Cunningham	DR-308J	6510	
7	590 08/25/2004		EXAMINER		
Joseph S Iandiorio		ı	, CHAPMAN	, CHAPMAN JR, JOHN E	
Iandiorio & Te 260 Bear Hill I			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Waltham, MA 02451-1018			2856		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/200-	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	A1:4(-)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/543,612	CUNNINGHAM ET	AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John E Chapman	2856				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears amination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the contract which a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	•					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 	s Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	period set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) ☑ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 26-42						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
O.						
		John E Chapman Primary Examiner	→			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/543,612

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The changes to the claims are substantive and not mere typographical errors. The dependency of claims 31-33 has been changed, and it is not clear that there is support in the disclosure for a second and a third transducer on a piezoelectric layer, as recited in claim 32. Furthermore, such may necessitate a new ground of rejection.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive. The level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art is a factual inquiry to be resolved in determination of obviousness under 35 USC 103, as set forth in Graham v. John Deere. The fact that the level is high does not preclude a determination of obviousness.